

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICERECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 20 2008

PATENT APPLICATION

Mohammad Hossein Zarrabizadeh

CASE 23

Serial No. 10/673894 Group Art Unit 2624

Filed September 29, 2003

Examiner S. H. Azarian

Title Watermarking Scheme For Digital Video

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Enclosed is an amendment in the above-identified application.


NO ADDITIONAL FEE REQUIRED

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit Deposit Account No. 12-2325 as required to correct the error.

Respectfully,

Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36658
732-949-1857.Date: 5/20/08Docket Administrator (Room 2F-192)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
600-700 Mountain Ave.
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents Fax No. 571-273-8300 on the date shown below.


Michele M. Butter 5/20/08
Date

Page 1 of 1

Serial No. 10/673,894

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERIN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAY 20 2008

Patent Application

Inventor(s): M. H. Zarabizadeh

Case: 23

Serial No.: 10/673,894

Group Art Unit: 2624

Filed: September 29, 2003

Examiner: S. H. Azarian

Title: Watermarking Scheme For Digital Video

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

This communication is in response to the final Office Action dated November 21, 2007.

Remarks

Claims 1-36 and 38-39 are pending in the application.

Claims 36 and 38 stand allowed. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 36 and 38.

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-30 and 32-35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,590,996 issued to Reed et al. on July 8, 2003.

Claims 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,538,599 issued to David on March 25, 2003.